

December 12, 1980

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 16457

died in Wake County. I represented him in the criminal actions arising out of his accident and I can assure you that he conducted himself in the finest traditions of our profession as did everyone else involved in the case. Not once did any of us seek special treatment and not once were we granted any special treatment.

No manslaughter charges were ever formally lodged against Charlie. The officers investigating the case sought, instead, a coroner's inquest which they apparently felt would be a more suitable means of airing Charlie's conduct. A coroner's jury was empaneled by the then Wake County Coroner, M. W. Bennett. The evidence was produced and we offered testimony and argued the case vigorously. I had no contact with any juror and did not personally know any member of the coroner's jury. The coroner's jury found no probable cause.

I'm sure you know that Charlie was charged in a form warrant with failing to yield right of way in violation of G.S. 20-155(b). I have not gone back to look at the official court file but I do recall trying the case, offering testimony and arguing the case vigorously. I have retained my notes prepared in advance of trial from which I argued this case both to the coroner's jury and to the District Court judge.

The major thrust of our position was this: Charlie had not consumed any alcoholic beverages so there was no evidence of the use of alcohol. He was well rested and there was no evidence he was drowsy or sleepy at the time he was operating the motor vehicle. He had not used any drugs. He was not speeding. His car was in good working condition. In addition, there was a background of heavy lighting from stores and shops at the intersection behind the motorcycle. I have always believed the motorcycle lights blended with these lights. This was clearly a civil case. I never felt it was properly in the criminal courts. The coroner's jury did exactly what it should have done. Frankly, I would have been shocked had the coroner's jury found probable cause. The District Court judge did exactly what he should have done. I have tried dozens of cases like this and this case was handled rather routinely by the court. I did have the feeling at the time these matters were litigated that had Charlie not been a lawyer, no coroner's jury would have been necessary. However, the fact that the case was given closer scrutiny because of Charlie's position did not trouble us. We welcomed the coroner's inquest.

As I recall, there were three members of the Highway Patrol involved in this case. Troopers Wood and Ward and Sergeant Hemphill investigated it. Anyone who knows these officers would vouch for their credibility. Their reputations are above reproach. They investigated the case carefully and held nothing back in testimony.

Please let me know if I can give any further information.

With kind regards, I am

Yours very truly,

WADE M. SMITH. ●

THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT OF 1980

● Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I am gratified to see that President Carter has signed the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 into law (Public Law 96-511). The new law is aimed at lessening Government paperwork, which is burdensome and costly to the private and public sectors. It will be especially helpful in eliminating the excessive and unnecessary reporting requirements currently being imposed by the Federal Government on small businesses.

Mr. President, the burden of Government paperwork on businesses and the American taxpayer has reached absurd proportions. It is excessive and unnecessarily duplicative.

Instead of keeping paperwork at a minimum, most Federal agencies have imposed excessive and duplicative requirements. Little consideration is ever given to the cost, both in dollars and in time spent filling out agency forms and questionnaires.

Time and time again, businessmen have expressed to me their concern about the mountains of Federal forms which they are required to file each year. Their claims have been substantiated in congressional hearings and Government studies. Numerous studies have estimated that American businesses are spending millions of hours each year and billions of dollars responding to Federal requirements. Others suggest that these figures do not even come close to measuring the true cost of complying.

Many Federal agencies have already taken meaningful steps to eliminate unnecessary paperwork requirements. Those agencies deserve to be commended for their efforts. Additional steps, however, are sorely needed to properly and efficiently manage the Government's information collection procedures. Federal agencies need to better coordinate their efforts and to continue to search for new ways to reduce the unnecessary burdens and costs of Government reporting requirements.

What is perhaps even more disturbing is that many Federal agencies are requiring businesses to report information which is to varying degrees available in the files of other agencies. In my view, this goes to further prove that heaps of worthless forms can be eliminated. As my distinguished colleague and chairman of the Small Business Committee, Mr. NELSON, stated earlier this year on the Senate floor:

Government paperwork could be cut 50 to 75 percent and at the same time improve the quality of the information submitted.

I share that view and want to reaffirm my commitment to minimizing reporting requirements to the extent practicable and possible.

Public Law 96-511 standardizes the Government's system for information collection and recordkeeping requirements. It establishes the Federal information locator system, a priority of the Commission on Federal Paperwork. It would provide documentation to business and the Federal Government of what information is required and what information has already been collected.

The information locator system is designed to eliminate duplicative reporting requirements, application forms and questionnaires. It will allow, whenever possible, the use of one single form to gather information for many different offices and departments.

This law assigns the Office of Management and Budget responsibility for paperwork review and coordination activities. Paperwork requirements of all Federal agencies, departments and independent commissions will for the first

time be reviewed and coordinated by a single office.

In addition, the Paperwork Reduction Act is intended to make the Federal Government more accountable for its actions. The same type of accountability that small businessmen are subjected to time after time as the result of requirements of Federal agencies.

As a member of the Senate Task Force on Small Business, I have become more acutely aware of the paperwork burden which every small business faces. Paperwork reduction was one of the priority items on the agenda of the task force. Also, this bill signed yesterday by the President is a direct response to the White House Conference on Small Business.

Earlier this year, I joined Senator NELSON in sponsoring legislation to reduce Federal paperwork. Much of the same principles which were embodied in that bill are included in Public Law 96-511. Most importantly, this new law fulfills our primary objective of reducing Government paperwork. ●

TRIBUTE TO TIM LEE CARTER

● Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, when the 96th Congress ends, the Kentucky congressional delegation will be losing a valuable Member and good friend when TIM LEE CARTER retires after 16 years in the House. Although TIM LEE and I have served in different bodies and on different sides of the aisle, I will sorely miss his voice of reason, compassion and moderation.

TIM LEE has rarely sought the spotlight in Kentucky or national news, but he has become well known and well respected for his quiet effectiveness, especially on the Commerce Health Subcommittee, on which he is the ranking Republican. As a former small town physician, he has never forgotten his roots in his efforts to provide better health care for all.

TIM LEE has been described as someone who "is more concerned about people than issues. He views his constituents as patients and not just voters who come together at election time." I think that about says it all.

TIM LEE has always had strong respect and love for the people he represents in southeastern Kentucky, and although his leaving will be a loss to us, I am sure he will enjoy the opportunity to spend more time at home and with the people he has represented so well for 16 years.

Mr. President, on December 1, an article on TIM LEE CARTER by Mike Brown appeared in the Courier-Journal, and I ask that this article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

LEAVING THE HOUSE FOR HOME: TIM LEE CARTER CHOSE OWN PATH
(By Mike Brown)

WASHINGTON.—The House was debating a stringent anti-abortion amendment one day last August when Kentucky's Tim Lee Carter took the floor to speak against it, making a personal point about conservative John Ashbrook of Ohio.

"Today I was sitting with the proponent of this amendment at lunch, and he stated that, if his daughter were raped, he would

S 16458

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

December 12, 1980

pay (the medical) bill to see that she did not carry the child," said the 5th District Republican from Tompkinsville.

Ashbrook, a vocal opponent of abortion, immediately denied that he had said such a thing, prompting the Kentuckian to suggest that his colleague was being less than forthright.

That exchange, uncharacteristically strong for a body that exudes courtesies, does not appear in the written House record.

Using a lawmaker's prerogative of revising the record, it's even been erased from the official tape recording, apparently at Ashbrook's request, definitely not Carter's.

The August incident is worth telling because of what it says about Tim Lee Carter's 16-year career in Congress—a career that ends this week in voluntary retirement.

A physician by profession, the 70-year-old Carter has the soft-spoken, gentlemanly demeanor that perfectly fits a kind country practitioner.

Yet, as a public figure, Carter has often been unpredictable, sometimes colorfully so.

Take, for example, the time in 1972 when he slugged an anti-war demonstrator blocking the access to his hotel at the Republican National Convention. "I didn't mean to hurt him," he explained later.

The point is that, while Carter is generally a political conservative, he has toed no line.

The issue of abortion is a good example. He says he is opposed to it, and has never performed one. But Carter also says that, in cases of rape, incest and saving the mother's life, abortion is a necessity.

Carter was also not easy to pigeonhole on the Vietnam War.

In 1967 he gained attention as the first member of Congress to call for the outright withdrawal of U.S. troops.

One of his favorite stories is that, after a congressional trip to Vietnam in 1966, he was the only one among the 14 official travelers to tell Lyndon B. Johnson to his face: "No, Mr. President, we're not winning the war."

Yet when there were efforts to cut off funds for the conflict, Carter voted against them, saying he didn't want to do anything that would deny American soldiers the rifles they needed to defend themselves.

And in 1972 he called for saturation bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong if it would save American lives.

Then there's federal spending.

Hanging in the reception area of Carter's Washington office is a cartoon showing the congressman grasping two big money bags.

"The trick is to have the right man in Washington," reads the caption in a reference to the federal largess that has flowed into Carter's mountainous 5th District. Money that's been used for vocational schools, water systems, hospitals, libraries, airports, roads and recreational areas.

Carter voted for Johnson's Great Society programs and asks, "How could I come from a poor area and not support them?" He also opposed Richard Nixon's efforts to cut programs for rural America.

Yet Carter considers himself a fiscal conservative and calls for a balanced federal budget. "I was for them (the social programs), but I was for enough taxes to pay for them," he said in a recent interview in his office, now littered with packing boxes.

So has Tim Lee Carter been unpredictable, a maverick? "I don't deny it," he said. "I follow my conscience."

In the early 1970s, Ralph Nader's Congress Project published reports on individual lawmakers. The report on Carter concluded that he "is more concerned about people than issues. He views his constituents as patients and not just voters who come together at election time."

The analogy is especially appropriate because it points to Carter's most active area in Congress.

He is the top Republican on the House subcommittee that handles health legislation, and it is there that he has devoted most of his efforts—efforts that Democrats say will be sorely missed.

"Tim was a very moderating influence and could carry the Republican side for moderate health legislation," said Richardson Preyer, a North Carolina Democrat and subcommittee member who was defeated for re-election this November. "It's going to be hard to replace him in that respect."

Carter may not be remembered as the lead actor in the passage of major laws for medical and dental schools, hospital planning, family planning, and research into cancer and other diseases.

But he consistently gets strong reviews for his supporting role as a Republican physician who understood the issues and sought consensus rather than headlines.

"He is the member that the subcommittee will most miss. I mean that, and I worked for Preyer," said Andrew Burness, who is now with the President's Commission on Medical Ethics.

Perhaps because medical legislation can be technical, Carter's health work didn't get a lot of attention in the Kentucky news media.

But it did among medical groups and publications. His office wall is covered with more than 50 plaques and citations, many from health and research organizations.

In 1978, the last year in which he ran, health-related groups provided more than 40 percent of the \$46,400 his campaign raised.

"People have considered him our voice because of the fact he's a physician and the fact we have worked closely with him," said John Zapp, a lobbyist for the American Medical Association, one of the givers.

But the truth, Zapp said, is that Carter never hesitated to disagree with the association. Most recently they split on the controversial bill to expand health care for poor children under Medicaid. Carter supported it through House passage; the AMA did not. (It's now tied up in the Senate.)

"I certainly don't think he was regarded as any tool of the AMA," Preyer said of Carter. "But as a physician, he was seen as a spokesman who understood the physician's side of things and the delivery side of things."

Carter and his wife, Kathleen, also understood the personal, tragic side. In 1977, their only child, William Starr Carter, died of leukemia at age 22.

Carter says that only made him work harder on health legislation.

Carter has also been an active foreign traveler, taking a number of official trips. But his travels at public expense, Carter said in the interview, were always at the request of House leaders, and they were always work.

Carter's only really unfavorable publicity was a 1976 Wall Street Journal story naming him as one of several congressmen who claimed official travel funds for which he wasn't entitled.

Carter blamed it on a secretary's mistake and reimbursed the government. He said the incident hurt him deeply.

The Carters now plan to live in their Tompkinsville home, staying pretty much out of politics and spending winters in Florida or Arizona.

Carter's financial disclosure report for 1979 suggests he doesn't have to work: Investment income that year totaled at least \$71,000, with assets worth about \$1 million to \$2.5 million. (Only ranges of values must be given on a congressman's report.)

Nevertheless, Carter, who had a coronary bypass operation last year, says he will work—tending to farms he owns in Monroe County and carrying on a limited medical practice, which he never completely gave up.

"Leaving here doesn't mean I'm going to sit in a rocking chair," he said.

Immediately after Ronald Reagan's elec-

tion as president, Carter was suggested by some Kentucky Republicans as secretary of Health and Human Services in the new administration.

While branding himself a long shot, Carter didn't hide his desire for the job. Late last week, however, he said he didn't believe he was on the final list of candidates, although he has been asked to serve on the department's transition team.

So is Tim Lee Carter at all sad as he returns to the ranks of regular citizenship?

"No, not really," he said. "I've had a great time." ●

CHILD HEALTH

● Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the report of the Select Panel for the Promotion of Child Health has been officially presented to Congress. We appreciate the work of this panel, and we will be reviewing their data, their analyses, and their recommendations with great care and interest.

In presenting the report to the Congress and the press it was pointed out that the select panel was created by a Congress controlled by Democrats. Some concern was expressed that the new administration, and a Senate controlled by Republicans might not be responsive to child health issues.

Mr. President, the health and well-being of our Nation's children is of prime interest to each of us. Raising healthy children is not a partisan concern. I know I speak for all my Republican colleagues when I say that promoting a healthy life, particularly for our Nation's children, is a concern that should and will receive careful attention in a Senate in which the Republicans are in the majority.

It is particularly gratifying, Mr. President, to see that several of the recommendations made by the Select Panel for the Promotion of Child Health have been implemented in my home State of Utah for many years. The necessity for pregnant, or potentially pregnant, women to avoid smoking, drinking, taking drugs, or other potentially harmful substances has long been recognized by many of my Utah constituents. The importance of proper nutrition has also long been part of our Utah approach to child health. As a result of our positive practices relating to child health, I am pleased to note that Utah, while maintaining the highest birthrate in the Nation, has one of the lowest infant mortality rates.

In developing legislative approaches to improving child health we must couple our enthusiasm with some principles of sound program evaluation and management. Some of our current programs are reaching only a small percentage of the target children; they have not been fully implemented by the States, frequently for good reason; too often, no cost accounting is accomplished to help us evaluate program effectiveness. During this Congress bills have been presented to pour billions more into these ineffective programs.

Mr. President, the day is past when the American people will allow us to respond to ineffective Federal programs by pouring more money into them in the hope that they will work better. It is my hope, Mr. President, as we move into the 1980's